

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-12, 14, 16-20, and 27-29 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 11, and 19 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated June 20, 2007, Claims 1-3, 5, 7-12, 14-20, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-12, 14, 16-20, and 27-29 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Paula for the courtesy of a telephone interview on August 15, 2007, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not render obvious the claims as currently amended. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action dated June 20, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-12, 14, 16-20, and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Star Office 5.1 Memorandum ("*Star Office*") in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0049294 A1 ("*Keen*"). Claims 1, 11, and 19 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "activating a privacy option comprising computer-implemented instructions provided by the document-generating application and removing from all portions of the first document except for a body of the first document one or more pieces of the personal information without deleting the first document, the one or more pieces of the personal information being requested by the document-generating application during installation of the document-generating application." Amended Claims 11 and 19 each includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 12, lines 11-29 and on page 13, lines 9-23.

In contrast, *Star Office* at least does not teach or suggest the aforementioned recitation. For example, *Star Office* merely discloses screenshots associated with a properties dialog box for viewing and editing StarWriter document properties. Consequently, *Star Office* is completely silent regarding: i) removing from all portions of a document, except for a body of the document, one or more pieces of personal information and ii) the one or more pieces of the personal information being requested by a document-generating application during installation of the document-generating application.

Furthermore, *Keen* does not overcome *Star Office's* deficiencies. *Keen* merely discloses that, after given an access identification, a user can access a database system and request access to an object. (See paragraph [0007], lines 1-3.) The system then retrieves information pertaining to the individual user's privilege criteria and determines which information contained in the database may be accessed by the user.

(See paragraph [0007], lines 3-6.) The system then filters the information including objects, their attributes, and associated documents according to the privilege information and gives the user limited access to the information. (See paragraph [0007], lines 6-9.) The requested and approved information can then be sent to the user. (See paragraph [0007], lines 9-11.) Like *Star Office*, *Keen* at least does not teach or suggest: i) removing from all portions of a document, except for a body of the document, one or more pieces of personal information and ii) the one or more pieces of the personal information being requested by a document-generating application during installation of the document-generating application. Rather *Keen* merely discloses: i) filtering information including objects, their attributes, and associated documents according to privilege information and ii) giving a user limited access to the information. Nowhere does *Keen* teach or suggest leaving in the body of a document personal removed from all other portions of the documents and the removed personal information having been requested by an application during installation.

Combining *Star Office* with *Keen* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Star Office* and *Keen*, either individually or in any reasonable combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "activating a privacy option comprising computer-implemented instructions provided by the document-generating application and removing from all portions of the first document except for a body of the first document one or more pieces of the personal information without deleting the first document, the one or more pieces of the personal information being requested by the document-generating application during installation of the document-generating application," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 11 and 19 each includes a similar

recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 11, and 19 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 11, and 19.

Dependent Claims 3, 5, 7-10, 12, 14, 16-18, 20, and 27 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 11, and 19, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 11, and 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent 3, 5, 7-10, 12, 14, 16-18, 20, and 27.

III. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment After Final be entered by the Examiner, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of

this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this amendment and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: September 20, 2007

DKS:mdc

/D. Kent Stier/

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

